UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/589,167	08/11/2006	Philippe Gilberton	PU040009	6842
²⁴⁴⁹⁸ Joseph J. Laks	7590 08/18/200	EXAMINER		
Thomson Licen		TRINH, TAN H		
PO Box 5312	e Way, Patent Operations		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
PRINCETON, NJ 08543			2618	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/18/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/589,167	GILBERTON ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	TAN TRINH	2618	
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	opears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING ID. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statu Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIO .136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tid d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS fron the, cause the application to become ABANDONI	N. mely filed n the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>05 I</u> This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This action is FINAL . Since this application is in condition for allowed closed in accordance with the practice under	is action is non-final. ance except for formal matters, pr		
Disposition of Claims			
4) Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/ Application Papers 9) The specification is objected to by the Examin	awn from consideration.		
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on 11 August 2006 is/are Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correctable. The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	e: a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ objected e drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se ction is required if the drawing(s) is ob	ee 37 CFR 1.85(a). Djected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documer 2. Certified copies of the priority documer 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documer application from the International Burea * See the attached detailed Office action for a list 	nts have been received. nts have been received in Applicat ority documents have been receiv au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	tion No red in this National Stage	
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal I 6) Other:	oate	

Application/Control Number: 10/589,167 Page 2

Art Unit: 2618

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. Claim 12 is objected to because of the following informalities: claim 12 is dependent to claim 9. The new amendment left out the claim 12 is dependent to claim 9. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 1-4, 7-8 and 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over King (U.S. Patent 7,289,775) in view of Demir (U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0248516).

Regarding claims 1, King teaches an apparatus (see fig. 2-3), comprising a receive chain (68 and 44) and a transmitting chain (64 and 42) (see fig. 3, col. 2, lines 10-24), which receives signal and transmits signal during separate time intervals (see fig. 3, col. 2, lines 10-24), wherein it further comprises: power amplifying (36) means for amplifying a transmission signal (64) (see fig. 3); and control (64) means for controlling amplifying (46) means based on a power level and leakage signal (68) (see fig. 3-4, col. 5, lines 1-67 and col. 6, lines 1-10), and the intermodulation products being represented by leakage signals (68) going through switch (38) to signal receiving elements (52 and 44) during the transmitting mode (see fig. 2-3, col. 2, lines 16-23 and col. 5,

Art Unit: 2618

lines 15-40). But King does not mention the estimation of third order intermodulation products associated with the power amplifying.

However, Demir teaches the estimation of third order intermodulation products associated with the power amplifying (see fig. 5, power estimation unit (505), page 4, section [0050]). In this case, the estimation unit (505) which estimates the power using I^2+Q^2 and product of TPC (transmit power control) and The LUT (555) provides the RF characteristics information associated with the power amplifying, and RF parameter standards characteristics, such as intermodulation products, and that is obvious to the third order intermodulation products (see page 2, section [0036]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to modify above teaching of King with Demir, in order to monitor the leakage signal and associated with the power amplifier and compressed leakage signal by compensation module (see suggested by Demir on page 4, sections [0046-0047]).

Regarding claim 2, King teaches the control means controls a bias current associated with the power amplifying means (see fig. 2, power control circuit (40), col. 4, lines 14-21).

Regarding claim 3, King teaches further comprising signal transmitting means for wirelessly transmitting the transmission signal (see fig. 2-3. col. 3, lines 5-8).

Regarding claim 4, King teaches for switching (38) means for providing passage of transmission signal (64) from the power amplifying (36) means to the signal transmitting means; and wherein a leakage signal (68) associated with the switching (38) (see fig. 2-3, col. 5, lines 15-40), and Demir teaches the estimation of third order intermodulation products associated with the power amplifying (see fig. 5, power estimation unit (505), page 4, section [0050]), So that the combination of King and Demir is teaching the limitation of the claimed.

Regarding claims 7-8, King teaches the control means controls the power amplifying means only if a transmitting power level of the transceiver apparatus exceeds a predetermined threshold level or maintain (see fig. 2-3, col. 6, lines 38-45). In this case, the control the transmitting power level back to desired transmit power level, that is when the transceiver apparatus exceeds a predetermined threshold level. And in this case, when the bias current is maintained the at its current level only if the transmitting power level of the transceiver apparatus does not exceed the predetermined threshold level, that is also well known in the art.

Regarding claim 18, King teaches the control means are set up using a single component such as a controller (see fig. 2-3, Power control circuit (40) or Processor (32)).

Regarding claim 19, King teaches switching means are set up using a single component such as a switch (see fig. 2, Switch (38), that is a single component as a switch).

4. Claims 5-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over King (U.S. Patent 7,289,775) in view of Demir (U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0248516) furthet in view of Haub (U.S. Pub. No. 2005/0026564).

Regarding claim 5, Demir teaches the filters. But Demir or King does not mention the performing of the filters. However, Haub teaches the transceiver apparatus includes a transmitting mode and a receiving mode; and the control means comprises digital filtering means for performing digital filtering operations during both the transmitting mode and the receiving mode (see fig. 3, Digital filter block 323, and high pass digital filter and low pass digital filter on fig. 5 and page 4, sections [0035-0037]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to modify above teaching of King and Demir with Haub, in order to filtering the noises and unwanted signals.

Regarding claim 6, Haub teaches the digital filtering means performs a high pass digital filtering operation during the transmitting mode, and performs a low pass digital filtering operation during the receiving mode (see fig. 3, Digital filter block 323, and high pass digital filter and low pass digital filter on fig. 5, page 4, sections [0035-0037]).

5. Claims 9-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki (U.S. Patent No. 5,909,642) in view of King (U.S. Patent 7,289,775) in view of Demir (U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0248516).

Regarding claim 9, Suzuki teaches a method for controlling a transceiver apparatus (see fig. 1, radio communication device, col. 1, lines 16-21), comprising: detecting a power level of third order intermodulation products associated with a power amplifier of the transceiver

Art Unit: 2618

apparatus (see col. 2, lines 28-57); and controlling the power amplifier responsive to the detection (see col. 2, lines 51-57).

Still regarding claim 9, Suzuki teaches detecting a power level of third order intermodulation products associated with a power amplifier of the transceiver apparatus during the transmission (see col. 2, lines 28-57). But Suzuki does not mention the newly added limitation of: Wherein the intermodulation products are represented by leakage signals going through a switch to signal receiving elements during the transmission. However, such teaching is taught by King (see fig. 3, when the transmit mode the amplifier (36) is amplify the output signal (64) resulting the signal (68) is leakage through a switch (38) to signal receiving elements (52), col. 5, lines 19-37). In this case, the Suzuki is teaches detecting a power level of third order intermodulation products associated with a power amplifier of the transceiver apparatus during the transmission, and that signal is go through the switch is taught by King.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to modify above teaching of Suzuki with King, in order to monitor the leakage signal and associated with the power amplifier and desired power level may be generated by the control system to offset and for compensate signal to attenuation at the switch (see suggested by King on col. 6, lines 1-10).

Regarding claim 10, Suzuki teaches the controlling step includes controlling a bias current associated with the power amplifier (see fig. 2col. 2, lines 52-57).

Regarding claim 11, Suzuki inherently teaches the bias current is reduced if an accumulator level is lower than a reference level and in that the bias current is increased if said accumulator level is higher than said reference level, said accumulator level being an estimate of power level of third order intermodulation products (see col. 10, lines 47-67).

Regarding claim 12, Suzuki teaches the bias current is modified only if a transmitting power level of the transceiver apparatus exceeds a predetermined threshold level (see col. 10, lines 52-56). In this case, the output level of the amplifier 40 increase than the bias current is increase.

Regarding claim 13, Suzuki inherently teaches the bias current is maintained at its current level only if the transmitting power level of the transceiver apparatus does not exceed the predetermined threshold level (see col. 10, lines 47-67). In this case, when the bias current is maintained the at its current level only if the transmitting power level of the transceiver apparatus does not exceed the predetermined threshold level, that is also well known in the art.

Regarding claim 14, Suzuki teaches using said power amplifier (35) to amplify a transmission signal; and using a switch (31) to provide passage of the transmission signal from the power amplifier to a signal transmitting element (see fig. 13, col. 9, lines 37-57).

Regarding claim 15, Suzuki teaches the signal transmitting element to wirelessly transmit said transmission signal (see fig. 1, radio communication device, col. 1, lines 16-21).

Application/Control Number: 10/589,167

Art Unit: 2618

Regarding claim 16, Suzuki teaches a leakage signal associated with the switch includes

Page 8

the third order intermodulation products (see fig. 13, col. 9, lines 42-65). In this case, the IM3 is

associated with the switch (31 or Q2).

Regarding claim 17, Suzuki teaches the detecting and controlling steps are performed if a

transmitting power level of the transceiver apparatus exceeds a predetermined threshold level

(see fig. 1, detecting 4, col. 2, lines 40-57). In this case, when the detecting the frequency

component related to the third order inter-mod distortion supply by the power amplifier exceeds

a predetermined threshold level than the adjusting the gate bias depend on the detecting.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-17 have been considered but are moot in

view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

7. Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(571) 273-8300, (for Technology Center 2600 only)

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to the Customer Service Window (now located at

the Randolph Building, 401 Dulany Street, Alexandria, VA 22314).

Application/Control Number: 10/589,167 Page 9

Art Unit: 2618

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Tan Trinh whose telephone number is (571) 272-7888. The

examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 9:30 AM to 6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiners

supervisor, Anderson, Matthew D., can be reached at (571) 272-4177.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is

assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding

should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone

number is (703) 306-0377.

9. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Tan H. Trinh

Division 2618

August 16, 2008

/TAN TRINH/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2618

08-16-2008